



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ties of the country at the peace settlement. Yours very sincerely,

LUCIA AMES MEAD,  
Secretary, Woman's Peace Party.

## II.

NEW YORK CITY.

To the Editor of ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

SIR: It is true that we opposed the entrance of this country into the war and used every honorable means at our command to prevent it. We believed that co-operation with other neutrals would have furnished a method of maintaining our joint rights without recourse to war and at the same time a means with which to hasten peace negotiations in Europe. We especially urged that if a democracy is to go to war it should go by direct mandate of the people through a referendum. After war had become a fact, we further urged that conscription was no fit weapon for a democracy to fight its wars with—that forcing men to kill and to be killed against their will does violence to the vital spirit and essence of democracy.

However, once the war and conscription became the law of this land, our agitation against them ceased. Common sense as well as loyalty and the habit of obedience to law counseled this course. We have never in the slightest degree urged or suggested resistance to the selective service law nor followed any other policy of obstruction.

What, then, has been our position? What have we asked of our Government during these critical months? Briefly this:

To begin with, we have insisted not merely upon the right, but upon the need for a full, free, and continuous discussion in the press and on the platform of America's war aims and peace terms. We have urged this that the militarists and imperialists might be exposed, that ignorance might be destroyed, that we might be faithful to the declared ideals for which our armed forces are fighting, and that the whole world might know us as the enemies of German aggression, but no less the friends of a Germany democracy.

We have at no time demanded an immediate peace or a separate peace. But when revolutionary Russia first pronounced its simple, generous practical peace formula—no forcible annexations, no punitive indemnities, free development for all nations—we urged that our Government should respond, stating its willingness to make peace on this formula. When the German Reichstag passed a resolution substantially endorsing this formula, we asked our Government to welcome the resolution officially, and thus strengthen the hands of the German liberals who were struggling to make it the avowed policy of their government. When the President replied to the Pope, we rejoiced to find him clearly standing for the Russian formula, and we advocated a further step, *i. e.*, that our Government should support the long unheeded request of Russia for a restatement of the Allied aims—a policy later supported by the Marquis of Lansdowne.

Today we still encourage this step. But we also look ahead to the inevitable cessation of hostilities, to the peace conference which must come. We are urging that

the ultimate agreement to be reached by the nations at that conference shall include free markets and free seas, universal disarmament, and a league of nations, the obvious essentials of an enduring peace. And since we are wise enough to know that these ends cannot be achieved at a gathering of military personages and appointed diplomats, we are demanding direct democratic representation of the people of all countries at the peace conference.

This is our complete war record. We hold that there is nothing treasonable or unpatriotic, or even emotional, about it. On the basis of that record we ask protection from the Government for our propaganda, no matter how popular it may become. We ask tolerance from those who think our ideas are wrong. And from those who think our ideas are fundamentally right, whether they agreed with us about the question of entering the war or not, we ask friendship and loyalty and support.

CRYSTAL EASTMAN,  
Woman's Peace Party of New York City.

## BRIEF PEACE NOTES

. . . That others besides ourselves experience our difficulty in maintaining in the popular mind the distinction between true and false pacifism—that is to say, between *pacifism* and *passivism*—is evident from a letter written to the editor of *La Paix par le Droit* ("Peace Through Justice," Paris), and appearing in the December, 1917, issue, by M. Ch. Maillard, one of the editors of the new French publication *La Société des Nations*. Calling attention to what he considers a specific instance of this confusion in a recent issue of *La Paix par le Droit*, M. Maillard defines the two forms of pacifism as "1. That of the Austrian throne, which is the pacifism of Wilhelm, of Lenine, of the German social-democrats and their followers in other countries. 2. Our pacifism, which is that of Mr. Wilson, of all true democratic thought, the pacifism that signifies horror of war and love of a durable peace. Teutonic pacifism does not wish *peace*, but a *peace*, an especial peace, favorable to the conqueror, and it wishes it now, while the appearance of victory may still be maintained. . . . Those who wish to pursue this war up to the point where the microbe of war will have been eradicated, are the true pacifists: we are these. To designate the others it is necessary to find a new word."

. . . In reply to the above plea, M. Ruyssen, editor of *La Paix par le Droit*, expresses a preference, as has the ADVOCATE OF PEACE only recently, for finding a new term for the true pacifists, probably on the ground that it is easier to put a new name on oneself than to tag another. M. Ruyssen reminds his readers and his correspondent that, as early as May, 1915, he urged the adoption of the name "*Juripacisme*" in preference to "*Pacifisme*," of which the nearest English translation is "*Juripaxism*." M. Ruyssen claims that this not alone better conforms to the laws of etymology than does "*Pacifism*," but that it also bears a more accurate meaning, since it signifies literally *la paix par le droit* (peace through justice), which M. Ruyssen very nat-

usually considers the most accurate phrase descriptive of the true aims of the war. Among other names suggested M. Ruyssen mentions "*Mondialisme*" ("world-wide-ism"), proposed by M. Lepert, but calls it vague, "for so many things are world-wide—commerce, science, even the war itself!" One reader, he assures us, has proposed "*wilsonisme*," which he calls "clear, and correct also."

. . . Unity of the peoples and security for the peoples are the two bases of labor's support of the ideal of an association of nations, according to Arthur Henderson, British labor leader and member of Parliament. In a recent article in *The Labor Woman*, he asserts that the only practical proposal for attaining unity and security is a league of nations. Labor, however, recognizes such a league of nations only as a first step towards a league of peoples. International machinery of justice, such as a "world court," "councils of conciliation," etc., it regards as valuable and necessary instruments, but "the ultimate guarantee of peace is in the resolute repudiation by every people of the imperialistic policies of their governments." "Do not let us make the mistake of supposing that this machinery alone will constitute the league of nations. Do not let us forget," he urges, "that it is the people alone who make war possible; but for them the quarrels of governments and rulers would merely be weak and silly wrangles, having no bearing upon the life of the world."

. . . Historically the world has always tended towards union, and even the present retrograde step that Russia is making cannot deter the steady progress of this coming together of the peoples. This is the opinion stated by Prof. John Bates Clark in a recent interview with a representative of the *Christian Science Monitor*. Professor Clark discussed the objections of Sir Edward Carson to a league of nations, pointing out that the Briton's objections were chiefly to a league in which Germany would be included, and stated his opinion that any attempt to effect a league of nations, particularly of the "enforcing peace" description, between democracies and autocracies, would be futile now and for at least two generations to come. Even with the Entente in partial control after the war, if Germany or the Central Powers combined were still in any sense a possible military menace, the plan would fail. A league to enforce arbitration could succeed only if the Central Powers and the Entente were evenly balanced, or the Entente clearly overbalancing the Teutonic alliance. Professor Clark finds an open league formed of all nations by free consent comparable only to the "delectable mountains" of a far-distant future. His preference is for a peace amply guarded by a dominant power and participated in willy-nilly by former disturbers of the peace.

. . . The growing power of labor to decide the issues of the war is pointed out by Sir John Foster Fraser, chairman of the British National War Lectures Committee, in an interview granted in New York last month. "Labor the world over," he declares, "is tired of the war." As it is they who fight, once they are conscious of themselves it is they who will name the price of their continued service. British labor, he assures us, is as

determined as ever to win the war. They are ready to make further sacrifices. But, in sober consideration of the toll already taken, "in many minds there is this great desire to see whether Germany cannot be persuaded or forced, not by outsiders, but by action of her own democratic party, to give up the occupied territory now instead of being forced to later on, after more unnecessary bloodshed." Therefore he states it as certain that there will be a great labor peace conference this year, participated in by representatives of all the Entente nations, and, if humanly possible, by German and Austrian representatives as well. To us this may seem hardly possible, but Sir John would have us remember that England's influence has weight, and that in England (the italics are at his request) "*no government can stand up against organized labor.*" Further, "our labor people are not hotheads, but thinkers. They move with deliberation, but with great determination. Whatever is decided, is decided most carefully."

. . . Interesting as an example of the broad principles and definite stand of the British Labor Party is that portion of its "Report on Reconstruction" dealing with internationalism. This report was prepared with great care by a sub-committee for consideration by the party, and is subject to modification and amendment. It is not a permanent document, but at least one careful critic, *The New Republic*, declares it "probably the most mature and carefully formulated program ever put forth by a responsible political party." The "plank" referred to reads:

"As regards our relations to foreign countries, we disavow and disclaim any desire or intention to dispossess or to impoverish any other state or nation. We seek no increase of territory. We disclaim all idea of 'economic war.' We ourselves object to all protective customs tariffs; but we hold that each nation must be left free to do what it thinks best for its own economic development, without thought of injuring others. We believe that nations are in no way damaged by each other's economic prosperity or commercial progress; but, on the contrary, that they are actually themselves mutually enriched thereby. We would therefore put an end to the old entanglements and mystifications of secret diplomacy and the formation of leagues against leagues. We stand for the immediate establishment, actually as a part of the treaty of peace with which the present war will end, of a universal league or society of nations, a supernational authority, with an international high court to try all justiciable issues between nations; an international legislature to enact such common laws as can be mutually agreed upon, and an international council of mediation to endeavor to settle without ultimate conflict even those disputes which are not justiciable. We would have all the nations of the world most solemnly undertake and promise to make common cause against any one of them that broke away from this fundamental agreement. The world has suffered too much from war for the Labor party to have any other policy than that of lasting peace."

. . . According to the leader of the British Labor delegation that reached this country in the second week in February, British labor is regarding President Wilson as one of the great leaders of the new era. The head of the mission is the Honorable Charles Duncan, M. P. He said:

The speeches of your President have run through our country as a call of help to the world struggling against the autocracy of the Kaiser. These speeches will be remembered as long as humanity exists. They have brought joy, they have brought hope, they have brought inspiration to the

minds and hearts of millions of people speaking your tongue, having your thoughts, believing in your aspirations and dreams.

These people have been given new life, new hope, new inspiration in the fight against this demon that menaces the world. These speeches are treasured by the British-speaking people in their wide-flung empire. They indicate that the world of intelligence, the world of thought, the world of education, the world of freedom, the world of life, is with them to the end.

Mr. Duncan told his hearers at a large mass meeting in New York City not to worry about talk of mistakes in the conduct of the work in this country. He said:

That is a very old story in every country. And I do not mind admitting—because there is no disgrace in admitting it—that there have been mistakes made in Britain. There have been mistakes for the best of reasons, that we, like America, were a people of peace. There have been no mistakes made in Germany in the production of guns and munitions; the only mistake they made was in starting it. And I am inclined to think that they would be mighty glad to be out of it if they could save their faces decently.

... If the British Government leaves the question of the disposal of African colonies mostly in abeyance, it does not appear that British people are failing to give due consideration to a just disposal of the matter. Of particular interest is a recent discussion of a small group of experts held under the auspices of the Aborigines Society. As reported, "the sense of the meeting was against direct international administration" of the disputed territories in tropical Africa, owing to the practical difficulties. "Control of national administrations by international agreements, to safeguard the rights of the natives, and to secure equal commercial opportunity for all nations," was the plan preferred. To make these agreements effective, it was agreed an international court must be established before which complaints might be brought by the parties aggrieved.

... Of the eight specific demands made by the German Socialists in the January strike, six were for interior reforms, and three of these relative to the conduct of the war. The other three related directly to the democratization of Germany. As the demands first appeared in the Berlin *Vorwärts* they are:

1. Accelerated conclusion of a general peace without indemnities or annexations.
2. Participation of workmen's delegates of all the countries in the peace pourparlers.
3. Amelioration of the food situation by better distribution.
4. Immediate abolition of the state of siege and restoration of the right of public meetings suspended by the military authorities.
5. Abolition of militarization of war factories.
6. Immediate release of all political prisoners.
7. Fundamental democratization of State institutions.
8. The institution of equal electoral suffrage by direct or secret ballot.

... "Thoughtful, conscientious men must read quietly and without prejudice the text of these speeches—the *real text*." This is Maximilian Harden's appraisal of President Wilson's address of January 8. Opinion in Holland declares the issue of *Die Zukunft*, in which these words appear, to be "the most remarkable that this editor has yet produced." Arraigning severely the an-

nexionists and the government's Russian schemes, and commending to sober consideration the Entente's arguments relative to Alsace-Lorraine, Herr Harden refers thus to the hope that President Wilson's address raised:

Firm still is the belief that peace is possible and that the cleft between the two fighting groups is no longer so wide that it can only be filled up by new heaps of corpses. It will, however, widen into an unbridgeable gulf if again the people refuse to acknowledge a changed world. That treaties are sacred; that the burdens of armaments and the possibility of war may be diminished; that nations be allowed the right of self-determination—these things we also desire.

... To understand the problem of the eventual condition of Austria-Hungary as a result of the war, writes a German citizen in the New York *Times*, it is necessary to lay aside all prejudiced consideration of that empire as a bundle of nationalities and to consider it strictly in relation to the rest of Europe. Not emancipation for this or that submerged nationality so much as the welfare of the rest of the European nations, is the important point upon which the issue should be joined. Democratization, asserts the writer, is simply a stage of national history. In Germany it is a comparatively simple matter of internal transformation, with preservation or easy retention of equilibrium. But in Austria the problem is complicated by the fact that democratization of the empire immediately runs into democratization of its many component parts. Further, the democratization of any one integral part of the empire means immediate dissolution. To cut the string of this bundle of fagots would be therefore a matter in which all Europe must take a hand. Yet this step, the writer declares, is one that must be taken, else any possible peace in Europe will be forever endangered.

... The policy of the Japanese Government concerning peace was recently defined in outline by Foreign Minister Motono, speaking before both houses of Parliament. Viscount Motono first declared that the mission to the United States had succeeded in establishing a full and mutual accord between the two nations, particularly in regard to co-operation in the further prosecution of the war. He later reminded his listeners that the Anglo-Japanese treaty engaged the two countries reciprocally not to conclude a separate peace, and that Japan was also held by her declared adherence to the same provision of the Declaration of London. "We do not yet believe the time has come for negotiations," he is reported to have said. "Japan has not received from any allied power whatsoever any proposition for a settlement. It is entirely superfluous to declare that Japan will continue with loyalty to support her allies with every means of assistance materially possible."

... A reassuring review of national conditions, problems, and policies as they are to be observed in Japan today appears in a special dispatch to the *Christian Science Monitor*. We are assured that there is ample reason why Japan has not taken a more conspicuous part in the war. Neither her financial condition nor her transportation facilities have warranted the forwarding of large bodies of troops to Western fronts. None of the Allies, particularly Russia, wanted Japan represented there, and Japanese military leaders were

convinced that the mingling of Japanese with Russians on the Eastern front would not benefit their allies materially, and would surely not redound to the credit of Japan. We are assured that the Japanese Premier, former Field Marshal Terauchi, is "an honest, simple, capable soldier and administrator—the very best man in Japan today for that office." "The Premier is an honest and an earnest man, and with the reins of the government in his hands there is no danger of a breach of faith or of failure on the part of Japan to keep her pledges. The government of Japan can be relied upon to tell the truth, and so long as the Premier retains his vigor it will not make more mistakes than the ordinary man in the street makes." Concerning affairs in China, the same writer says:

China does not seem to be any nearer to a solution of the interior problem of peace than she was six months ago. But as the writer has foretold frequently, the southern element is gradually gaining more and more strength and territory as an independent section from the Peking element. It looks as if Peking must be starved into submission or a compromise—the latter, of course, for the Chinaman will always compromise if he can. A good deal of killing is going on of which the world does not hear, and cares but little in these days. There is, of course, intense suffering and great hunger and misery among the lower classes during this exceptionally hard winter, and the writer looks for a settlement of sorts in the spring. The settlement will be a compromise Cabinet in Peking and possibly the appearance of some strong men.

... Neutral terms of peace may seem an anomaly, unless it be considered that the whole earth shall hereafter constitute a society of nations, in which naturally those now quiescent would have as great an interest as any other. Nevertheless, the new Swiss Society, through its Geneva branch, has framed such terms as the result of a recent debate on war aims, and has issued them in a bulletin of the society. Naturally, there is nothing official about them, but they are perhaps indicative of Swiss opinion generally on this subject. These are six in number, and are based on "Switzerland's interests" in the world settlement. Shorn of expositional matter, they are: 1. No hegemony of one nation in Europe; 2. The independence of small States must again (*sic*) be held inviolate; 3. The sanctity of treaties to be re-established; 4. The future peace favorable to democracy; 5. No theoretical and absolute principle of nationality established, and 6. "Our interests demand that the future image of Europe shall be like that of our country."

... The hyphen as a bar sinister is not an American manifestation solely, according to a dispute that lately found its way into the New York press. This takes the nature of a wrangle between Norwegians and Norwegian-Americans over the "absolute neutrality" which the Norwegian Government has proclaimed, and which Norwegian-Americans are inclined to regard as dictated from Wilhelmstrasse. One writer to the New York *Times*, Prof. John Eiesland, of West Virginia University, asserts quite plainly that Norway's reported disinclination to enter into a trade treaty with the United States is an unmistakable indication of such teutonism. He goes on to defend from "Norwegian" attacks the fair name of the Norwegian-Americans, which has been somewhat slurred by their stay-at-home brothers. To a letter from one Wilhelm Krag on this subject, in the

Norwegian *Tidens Tegn*, which is described picturesquely as "like an unfriendly whiff of the salty brine from the Skagerrak," Professor Eiesland replies in part as follows:

Norwegian literati have never been friendly to things American. The head of a business firm in Stavanger, who has written to me an appreciative letter anent my "traitorous" article, tells me that there are thousands in Norway who agree with me. Are these also traitors, Judases, degenerate sons of the Fatherland? If this is true, I am certainly glad to know that there are men in my native land who think that it is not sufficient to say you are "profoundly impressed" when the Germans practice their *Schrecklichkeit* on defenseless seamen and even women, who do not wish to plead "absolute neutrality" when attacked in the most brutal manner, who are not so afraid of the Prussian *Pickelhaube* that they will sacrifice their country's honor, who do not think it is honorable for Norway to ask the generous and large-hearted American people to sell them food and then supply the enemy of the United States with nickel, fish, &c.

There are in France today thousands of Americans; many are from the West and a goodly number of them are Norwegian-Americans. You cannot pick them out from a crowd of native Americans. They have the same ideals, the same wide view, the same genuine generosity and kindness of soul that distinguish the rank and file of the American people, the same hatred of tyranny and King power, the same innate love of justice and fair play; they are fighting the battle for liberty, for a better and freer Europe, which, in spite of its boasted civilization, never learned the lesson of how to live together without planning the one to destroy the other. Norway is immensely richer because of the Norwegian-American. He is an asset she can justly be proud of.

... In the last days of January Senator Borah, of Idaho, introduced into the Senate a resolution relative to the attitude of the United States towards the smaller nationalities. Although this has since been superseded practically entirely by the address of the President printed in this issue, it has a documentary interest. Its specifications are as follows:

1. That it is indispensable to the future permanent peace of the world that the national political and economic rights of small and subject nationalities be restored and conceded.
2. That if the coming peace is not to be illusory it must be inspired by justice alone and not by strategic considerations of the selfish, economic interests of the few strong powers; that the terms of peace should exclude all peace provisions which give any nation advantage, privilege or concession not equally shared in by other nations, and that hereafter when outside assistance is required by any country for the development of its potentialities the opportunity to share in this development shall be free and open to all other countries on equal terms.
3. That the right of each small and subject nationality to separate deliberative representation at the peace conference be recognized, and that its cause and interest be discussed and determined in open, public session.
4. That the nations that have declared themselves champions of world democracy and of the liberties of small and subject nations make their position clear to the world by pledging themselves to favor the admission of separate deliberative representatives of all nationalities into the peace conference.
5. That in no case should anyone be disturbed because of race, language or religion, nor on that account be subjected to intolerant treatment; that every one has a right to civil equality, liberty of conscience and religion, to the free use of his language and the pursuit of happiness.
6. That the repatriation of all persons exiled or forcibly removed from their homes for whatever alleged reasons be the first obligation of the power immediately responsible therefor.
7. That complete restitution should be made by such power for all private property destroyed, and full reparation for all damage done, and that these should be guaranteed by the power immediately responsible therefor.

8. That secret diplomacy, one of the traditions of autocratic and personal governments, the chief weapon of despotism and the most prolific source of the world's disturbance, is the one indispensable instrument for the oppression of small nations; that it has and can have no place in a democratic world, and should be rejected and discarded by all civilized nations.

... Public ownership of armament plants, limitation of armaments to a police basis, and the abolition of conscription are among the "war aims" supported by the women's sessions of the British Labor Party in congress at Nottingham in January. Greetings were sent to the women of America with the plea that they join in the demand for a league of nations. In this connection Mrs. Ada Solner, treasurer of the organization, declared it "an excellent occasion for us to urge upon our sisters in America how much they and we can do towards the realization of the league of nations which shall make war impossible. Let us both, then, resolve to continue without ceasing to press upon our respective governments that no peace shall be satisfactory to the women of England and America which does not provide for such international peace arrangements."

... A novel appeal to the women of Germany has recently been drafted by a group of women in California under the leadership, among others, of Mrs. Upton Sinclair. It is said that when a sufficient number of signatures is secured, this appeal will be forwarded to Germany. As reproduced in the Girard, Kan., *New Appeal*, it acknowledges first the debt of America to German women for their talented sons who have migrated hither and the fruits of the labors of their talented sons at home. Seeking to state the cause of the conflict, it denounces militaristic caste, and states the determination of American women that this caste must be thrown down, even at the cost of long-continued war. "We urge you to understand," it pleads, "that it is not merely himself, it is ourselves whom our President pledges to a peace of justice, of freedom and self-government for all the peoples of the world. It is for you, women of Germany, . . . to make your voices heard and your will obeyed, to establish your great and wonderful nation among those modern nations in which the people rule. . . . There will never be an invasion or conquest of a revolutionized and democratic Germany!"

... The only excuse for universal military training in this country is a German victory in this war, declares one member of this Society editorially in the Pullman, Wash., *Herald*. If this excuse is lacking, he urges, we must expect that a move so at variance with the professed policies of this nation, as implied in the declarations of President Wilson, will breed distrust of us throughout the world as of a nation that prays for a debtor and damns a creditor. He adds:

The peoples of the allied powers are making supreme sacrifices because they believe that the fruit of victory will be permanent peace and relief from the burden of maintaining great military and naval establishments. What a staggering blow it would be to their hopes to learn that this nation is not preparing for future peace but for future war? That instead of planning to reduce its military power the United States is planning to permanently increase it.

... The one hundred and fifty unofficial delegates who met not long ago at Berne for a "preliminary discussion of peace problems," representing Germany, Austria-Hungary, Switzerland, and Holland, succeeded in convening and adjourning without creating many ripples in the press of America. Only in the more careful and intelligent papers did American readers find enlightening accounts of the sessions. One such, translated in summary from *Der Bund* (Berne), states that, following a rather brief discussion of the different postulates of The Hague minority program, and the institution of an international and completely independent telegraph agency, the conference settled down for a lengthy discussion of the problem of nationalities. The theory brought out last July in the report of the International Study Committee of Christiania, to the effect that the rights of national minorities should be protected by international agreements and disputes of this kind submitted to an international court of arbitration was unanimously approved, as well as its corollary, that the will of the people ought to be considered in connection with agreements between governments as to a rearrangement of territory. Annexations by force were severely condemned. Methods of discovering the popular will in disputed territories were discussed without any enlightening method being brought out. At a subsequent session Herr Gothein, a prominent member of the Reichstag, insisted that an agreement as to the limitation of armaments must have a definite place in the treaty of peace, favoring limitation of expenditure as the determining factor. Professor Schücking, taking up the continuation of the work of The Hague, won approval with his emphasis of the necessity for continuing organized peace conferences, and also of establishing new international organizations for the settlement of international disputes. Professor Quidde, of Munich, reported for the committee appointed to deal with the disarmament question, declaring that an immediate limitation of armaments must be stipulated by the peace treaty, and that this limitation would automatically become total disarmament when once the machinery of international organization had been set in motion. In bringing the conference to a close, Herr Scherrer-Fülleman, the president, spoke of the problem of democratic control of foreign policy, instancing the case of Switzerland, where international agreements are subject to the approval of Parliament. It is said that the final debate on disarmament was a stormy one. Count Karolyi, who arrived too late for the conference, is reported to have expressed the proposal that there should be set up in Switzerland a permanent conference, constituting a kind of permanent European committee for the discussion of international questions. Dr. Jaszi, of Budapest, who was also interviewed, stated that the nationality problem in Hungary was not to be solved by splitting up the country, but by satisfying the desires of the wide masses of the people in the cultural, constitutional, and economic spheres. Ignoring the Hungarian Government's express declaration that the impending franchise measure will be calculated above all to consolidate Magyar supremacy, he added that the possibility of future development had been assured by the new proposals for electoral reform in Hungary, and that the new Parlia-



ment will probably alter the old policy of customs duties, which had the effect of shutting off the Balkan States from central Europe, and thus contributed to intensify the southern Slav question.

. . . Another instance of what must seem to the enemy intelligence bureau the hopeless boomerang effect of Teutonic plottings appears in the story of the new reciprocal arrangement between this country and Mexico relative to food and labor. According to press accounts, when the draft law was passed the German schrecklichkeit corps made friends with the Mexican peons working in United States sugar-beet fields, explaining that the new law would speedily put any Mexican found in this country in the French trenches. Homesickness became prevalent among these simple minds, with two unpleasant results, on only one of which Teutonic psychology had counted. Labor became scarce in the American Southwest, but also human beings became over-plentiful in Mexico, where the food supply was not up to the demand. These unofficial activities were followed by an embargo of labor from Mexico and an embargo of food from the United States. Unfortunately for the equanimity of the Teuton, reports say, the two forces established a balance, visible alike in Washington and Mexico City. Negotiations are now officially under way to the effect that Mexican labor may return to the United States in ample numbers, where its sustenance, received here, will satisfactorily relieve the food situation in Mexico, and there are indications that these negotiations will serve to bring the two governments into a more intimate understanding and closer sympathy.

. . . The Committee on Public Information has recently issued to its Four-Minute Men a recommendation urging them to eliminate "hymns of hate" from their utterances, although an appeal to fear is not banned. Stress is laid on the folly of attempting to inflame passions or to arouse emotions by appealing to sentiment rather than reason. "Not an appeal to emotionalism," declares the psychological expert of the committee, "but an appeal to the emotions through conviction by statement of facts, secures true converts, converts who, when once convinced, remain convinced."

. . . Among what might be called "non-pacifist factors for peace" is found the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce, described in a recent article in the *New York Journal of Commerce* by A. J. Barnaud, commercial agent in charge of this Government bureau. The bureau is located in the New York Customs House. Its activities consist in co-operating with American firms having representatives in Latin America, especially with regard to after-war trade, looking into new markets for American products, supplying information regarding the interpretation of the Trading with the Enemy Act and the general study of the influence of the international situation on after-war trade generally. "Through its representatives in foreign countries," writes Mr. Barnaud, "the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce—the liveliest of Government bureaus," as it has often been termed—has done much to co-ordinate the efforts of American commercial attaches, consular offi-

cers, and special trade representatives, and to make the entire system of trade promotion accessible and useful to American business men. During 1917 the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce has sent special agents to investigate the ports and transportation facilities of Russia, the Far East, and Australasia; the mineral resources of the Far East; the markets for American hardware in South Africa, India, and the Near East; the sale of agricultural implements and machinery and of furniture in South America; the opportunities for selling more electrical goods, textiles, and boots and shoes in Porto Rico, and the markets for construction materials and machinery in Cuba. American consuls, at the request of the bureau, have reported on the foreign demand for lumber, binder twine, imitation leather, moving-picture films, and other lines. . . . Within two years it is estimated that the United States will have enlarged its merchant marine to a total tonnage of more than 14,000,000, not far below that of Great Britain, which by that time is expected to have 15,500,000. Our foreign commerce will then be capable of unlimited development. But ships are not all we need. Salesmanship and service are almost as essential, and they include careful preparation and study, energetic trade promotion, learning the needs of our prospective customers, delivering the goods, and, above all, making friends of those who buy from us. . . . During the past three months the framework has been built for a Far Eastern division, to be organized along lines similar to those of the Latin-American division, which has compiled much valuable information regarding the trade of our southern neighbors."

. . . The Association Press, 124 East 28th street, New York City, has issued a booklet, copyrighted by Frederick Harris, and distributed by the General War-Time Commission of the Churches, 105 East 22d street, New York City, entitled "New Ventures of Faith: Suggestions for Greater Achievements Through Prayer: A Monthly Cycle for General Use." There are thirty-one subjects for prayer, of which twenty-eight are divided into seven main subjects: Humanity, National Affairs, War Victims, Christian Workers, Society, Church, Fellowship. Each subject is treated with one or more lay quotations for "meditation," a suggestion for "thanksgiving," a suggestion for "penitence," and suggestions (in some cases formal prayers) for "intercession." For example, the following quotation from a sermon preached by the Serbian priest, Nicholas Velimirovic, in St. Paul's Cathedral, London, July 22, 1917, is given for "meditation" under the topic for the second day of the month, "International Relations":

Men are seeing dimly through the smoke of battle the failure of their old ideals. They built high hopes a century ago on the assertion of the "rights of man" and the "rights of nations." The first were to be secured by good laws and institutions; the second by well-balanced treaties. What has come of it all? Every man for himself: capital against labor and labor against capital; every nation in Christendom trying to secure its trade against the rivalry of all the rest. "In holding fast to rights we have lost sight of duties, and above all, of the supreme duty of service and sacrifice." May we not pray . . . that consideration for the interest of others, which we all commend in individuals, may, by the grace of God, become the "leading light and solid principle in international relations"; that nations may learn to serve

one another, help one another, not merely in distress, but in all that furthers growth and progress—converted at last to the belief that this is really the best policy?

Another example is a prayer by Charles Gore, Bishop of Oxford, given as "intercession," under the twelfth-day subject, "Our Enemies":

Give Thy blessing, O Father, to the people of those great and fair lands, with whose rulers we are at war. Strengthen the hands of the wise and just, who follow charity and look for justice and freedom, among them as among us. Drive away the evil passions of hatred, suspicion, and the fever of war, among them as among us. Relieve and comfort the anxious, the bereaved, the sick and tormented, and all the pale host of sufferers, among them as among us. Reward the patience, industry, loving kindness and simplicity of the common people and all the men of good heart, among them as among us. Forgive the cruelty, the ambition, the foolish pride, the heartless schemes, of which the world's rulers have been guilty. Teach us everywhere to repent and to amend. Help us so to use our present afflictions, which come from us and not from Thee, that we may build on the ruins of our evil past a firm and lasting peace. Grant that, united in a good understanding with these who are now becoming our enemies, though they are our brethren in Christ, they and we may establish a new order, wherein the nations may live together in trust and fellowship, in the emulation of great achievements and the rivalry of good deeds, truthful, honest, and just in our dealings one with another, and following in all things the standard of the Son of Man, whom we have denied, and put to shame, and crucified afresh upon the Calvary of our battle ground. Amen.

These booklets are advertised for sale at 50 cents apiece, \$2 a dozen, \$5 for fifty, or \$10 a hundred, post-paid.

... No war before this has ever been fought for the sake of a durable peace, declared Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler, in an address before the Chamber of Commerce of St. Louis, on February 16. We are at war, he further said, not with any nation as such, but with an idea personified in a system of government that has attempted to establish this idea as a world ideal. "If this idea of world domination has been adopted by Japan (or Italy, or Russia) we should be at war with Japan." "The road to a durable peace begins at the point where this false notion of world domination is given up once for all." He continued:

Commercial interpenetration, financial control, and military dominance are the three forms in which the lust for world-power manifests itself. A free world made up of independent, liberty-loving nations must combine to prevent any one of these; the liberty-loving nations have almost with unanimity now combined in this war for that very purpose. . . .

The main thing is to remove from the world a notion and a purpose that compel armaments and that eventually force war. That notion and that purpose are those of world-domination. . . . The alternative to *Weltmacht* is not *Niedergang*. It is rather membership in a family of nations, each one of which is possessed of what I have described as the international mind. . . . Given this, and it will be easy to establish and maintain an international organization to keep the peace of the world, as well as to establish and maintain international economic relationships that shall promote human happiness and human satisfaction.

... A report from Petrograd states that Malcolm W. Davis, of Hartford, Conn., formerly assistant editor of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, and for the past year representative of the International Committee of the Young Men's Christian Association in the military district of Kazan, Russia, has been relieved from his work for the

committee, and has been appointed to the U. S. Government Committee on Public Information, Russian Department, which is in charge of Arthur Bullard, journalist, author, and war correspondent.

... Dr. Thomas E. Green, of Chicago, an honorary vice-president of the American Peace Society and a member of its lecture bureau, has been appointed Associate Director of the Speakers' Bureau of the Red Cross. Dr. Green is a volunteer, and will devote his entire time to the Red Cross. He is a well-known lecturer on the Lyceum and Chautauqua platforms.

## AMONG THE PEACE ORGANIZATIONS

### AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY

#### *New England Department*

On Sunday afternoons during February, Director and Mrs. Tryon have continued the social gatherings held in their studio apartments at the Falmouth Hotel, Portland. Their purpose has been to awaken interest in the study of international relations and to promote a fraternal feeling for the allied nations in this war. The attendance has been partly of guests at the hotel and partly of representative townspeople who have been specially invited, and it has been encouragingly good. An hour's formal talk by the speaker of the afternoon is the only fixed program, the rest of the time being devoted to questions and to a spirited general discussion.

Among the speakers have been Dr. J. Alexander O'Meara, of St. Luke's Cathedral, Portland, who was at one time assistant chaplain in the English church at Petrograd, and who gave some reminiscences of old St. Petersburg; Lieut. Col. John B. Keating, British Vice Consul, Portland; Inspector W. E. Stevenson, of the school department of Saskatchewan, and Capt. A. H. Ball, deputy minister of education in Saskatchewan, now of the 249th Battalion in Quebec, and engaged in recruiting work. Captain Ball spoke on Canada, especially on the Canadian West, when the afternoon was devoted to American and Canadian relations. The meeting was an international occasion that will long be pleasantly remembered.

On the following Sunday, Ernest Le Prohon, Honorary Vice Consul of France, gave an account of the work and functions of a consul, and Dr. Leopold Hurtubise, a French Canadian, told of the social life of the French and English in Montreal, and sang a number of characteristic French songs. Dr. Elias Caplan, in a wonderfully eloquent address, spoke one Sunday on "The Future of Jerusalem as a Jewish Commonwealth," and on another occasion Prof. Paul Nixon, of Bowdoin College, described the life of a Rhodes scholar at Oxford.

The New England Director, besides speaking at the annual meeting of the New Hampshire Peace Society, at Manchester, on February 6, gave, on February 8, a lecture at St. Alban's Chapel, Manchester, on the "Friendship of England and America," and on February 13 gave an address at New Hampshire College on "A League of Nations."

#### *South Atlantic States Department*

Atlanta has become the military center for the South, and the whole of its civic life is being affected by it.